

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 3, 2003 has been reviewed, and the application is amended herein in a sincere effort to place same in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

In the Office Action, the Examiner indicates that Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 21-60 are pending in the application, and that Claims 29-60 are withdrawn from consideration in view of the prior restriction requirement. **However, Claims 29-38 were under consideration by the Examiner in the prior Office Action (dated October 22, 2002), and were also indicated as allowable.** The Examiner has provided no reason for the withdrawal of Claims 29-38. These claims are directed to a workstation arrangement and are properly included in elected Group II. Further, the Examiner has provided no reasoning for his withdrawal of Claims 39-60, which are also directed to workstation arrangements and properly included in elected Group II. **Accordingly, it is believed that Claims 29-60 warrant consideration at this time.**

Further, as discussed in the last Response dated February 24, 2003, the Examiner in the Office Action dated October 22, 2002 indicated that a co-pending application should not be cited on PTO-1449, but should be cited in the specification. 37 CFR 1.98 indicates that any information disclosure statement filed under 37 CFR 1.97 shall include: "(1) A list of all patents, publications, applications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office". Further, 37 CFR 1.98(b)(3) states that "each U.S. application listed in an information disclosure statement must be identified by the inventor, application number, and filing date". Thus, related Application Serial No. 09/562 165 (now U.S. Patent No. 6 448 498) cited in the Information Disclosure Statement dated May 17, 2001 has been correctly cited and warrants consideration by the Examiner. While the '165

application is not believed to constitute prior art relative to the instant application, Applicants as well as the undersigned have a duty to disclose related applications to the Examiner. Accordingly, consideration of this related application and written acknowledgement of such consideration are requested.

As also discussed in the prior Response dated February 24, 2003, Applicants submitted Information Disclosure Statements on November 14, 2001, December 12, 2001 and December 27, 2001. None of these Information Disclosure Statements have been acknowledged by the Examiner. The above Information Disclosure Statements were filed before the issuance of the first Office Action on the merits, comply with 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98, and thus warrant consideration. For the Examiner's convenience, copies of these Information Disclosure Statements are enclosed. Copies of the references cited in these statements are not enclosed, as same have already been submitted. Acknowledgement of the references cited in the above-mentioned Information Disclosure Statements is requested.

Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 21-28 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. In response, Claims 1, 2 and 8 are amended herein in a manner believed to overcome the instant rejection. Further, Claims 39, 54 and 57-59, which are believed to warrant consideration at this time as discussed above, are also amended to remove language similar to that objected to by the Examiner in the above claims.

Applicants acknowledge, with appreciation, the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 1-4, 6-8 and 21-28. As discussed above, Claims 29-38 were previously indicated as allowable by the Examiner and are still believed allowable, and Claims 39-60 are believed to warrant consideration at this